DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 109 CS 503 004

AUTHOR Korzenny, Felipe: And Others
TITLE Cultural Identity and Communication Style among Mexican-Americans.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 38p.: Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer): Cultural Background: *Cultural Traits: *Ethnicity: *Hispanic American Culture: *Language Styles: *Mexican Americans: Research Methodology: Self Concept

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that the identification of individuals with a certain ethnic grouping may have a significant impact on the way they communicate with others. It contends also that the way in which people's style is used and interpreted by others directly influences their effectiveness in communicative interactions. The communicative styles of Mexican Americans are addressed along a continuum of cultural identity: (1) the "American of Mexican Ancestry" to describe individuals who would first identify themselves as plainly Americans: (2) the "Mexican American" to describe those individuals who are conscious of the duality of their existence and who live in conflict: (3) the "Chicano" to describe individuals who see themselves as part of a unique cultural entity separate from either Mexican or American culture: and (4) the "Mexican" to describe the cultural identity of one whose primary referent in day to day life is Mexican culture. In a subsequent section, testable hypotheses are suggested to provide a framework for researching the relationship between cultural identity and communication style. Appended are examples of cultural identity measures, a communicator style construct, and examples of communication style measures. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191109

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CULTURAL IDENTITY AND COMMUNICATION STYLE AMONG MEXICAN-AMERICANS

Felipe Korzenny - G. Blake Armstrong - Kimberly Neuendorf All at the Department of Communication, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 48824

The present paper examines the relationship between the constructs of cultural identity and communication style among Mexican-Americans. The main thesis in this paper is that different cultural identities among Mexican-Americans correspond to a variety of styles previously investigated in the communication literature. From the merge of the two conceptual traditions, hypotheses are derived and measures are proposed to test them. Finally, the paper concludes with clarifying notes to be taken into consideration when conducting this type of research.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Felipe Korzenny

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS503004

Paper presented at the 65th Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Antonio, Texas, November 10-13, 1979.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Cultural Identity and Communication Style Among Mexican Americans

Introduction

No longer are Mexican Americans a minority that can wait to be taken into consideration by the larger American culture. Increasingly, researchers and policy makers dedicate their efforts to the understanding of those processes that allow Mexican Americans adapt to the larger culture. Adaptation, on the other hand, is no longer seen as complete assimilation because a long history of social programs and discrimination point out the importance of keeping minority cultures alive for the richness of the larger society and for the better integration of those minorities.

Mexican Americans are not a homogeneous group which can be easily identified and characterized. Mexican Americans vary along multiple dimensions, such as place of origin, socio-economic status, generation, years in the U.S., etc. (Casavantes, 1971). Cultural identity is then one of the most pressing starting points in the consideration of Mexican American issues. If an individual does not identify him/herself as a Mexican American one may expect a definite pattern of behaviors to ensue from that self-characterization. On the other hand, if a Mexican American feels proud of that identity one would logically expect to encounter a set of behaviors, values and beliefs that are in accordance with that cultural identity.

In this paper the authors are concerned with the impact of cultural identity on the communication style of Mexican Americans. We will first conceptually address the issue of cultural identity among Mexican Americans and then we will proceed to examine relevant conceptual issues regarding communication style. In a subsequent section we will derive testable hypotheses from the above considerations and provide initial guidelines for researching the relationship between cultural identity and communication style.

Cultural Identity

Cultural identity seems to be a hard concept to grasp conceptually and difficult to operationalize. Cultural identity has been a concept with a long history of speculation and little empirical investigation. For one thing, it is a subjective mental construct; for another, it is a combination of individual, societal and cultural factors. What is strictly cultural is hard to separate from what is individual or societal. Erickson (1966) in referring to Freud said: "(identity is) experienced as 'identical' in the core of the individual and yet also identical in the core of a communal culture, and which is, in fact, the identity of those-two identities." (p. 149.)

Further, Erickson (1966) addressed identity as "one aspect of the struggle for ethnic survival: one person's or group's identity may be relative to another's; and identity awareness may have to do with matters of an inner emmancipation from a more dominant identity, such as the 'compact majority'." (p. 148.) Identity then is not clearly separable at the cultural level but it may have its roots and reference in culture. The aspect we are concerned with is the cultural component of the identity of an individual. A person has a way of thinking of him/herself regarding his/her individuality, his/her role in society, and his/her larger reference group of origin and socialization.

A Mexican American may think of him/herself as belonging mainly to the larger Anglo culture (if one can speak of one), or to the Mexican culture, or to both, none, or a third new Chicano culture. All these variations include tradition, customs, beliefs, values, social relations, foods, designs for living in general and an overall world view (Sarbaugh, 1979.) In some sense cultural identity is the reference group used by individuals when confronting everyday situations. But it is not only the cultural group that influences the reference of cultural identity but the constructs that go along with such reference group.

Mexican Americans are far from being a homogeneous community. There are those who would not like to be identified as Mexicans, and there are those who would not like to be considered American. There are some who would like to consider themselves as a separate entity. Peñalosa (1970) in trying to provide an overall classification of Mexican Americans describes a continuum in which one finds in one of the extremes those Mexican Americans that consider themselves to be "Americans of Mexican Ancestry" who would first identify themselves as plainly Americans. In the middle of the continuum one finds those individuals who consider themselves "Mexican American" who are constantly conscious of the duality of their existence and who live in conflict. At the other extreme one finds the "Chicanos" who are the more militant and separate cultural entity. Chicanos would more likely prefer to be identified as a unique result of the merging of two worlds.

The creation of a unique identity is an historical process which seems to be socially determined by networks of influence. Deluvina Hernandez (1970) hypothesized that "the maintenance of the Chicano or Mexican American or La Raza ethnic identity is dependent upon a functioning satellite system with a common focal point." (p. 15)

Obviously, cultural identity is expected to also depend on the other influences prevalent in the larger American culture. The media and contact with other ethnic or cultural groups is expected to have a strong influence on the way Mexican Americans look at themselves.

In looking at the cultural identity of Mexican Americans it is important to bear in mind the caution that Casavantes (1971) has made evident: "Today, it is clear that what many of the sociologic-anthropologic students have done is to accurately depict not the life of the Mexican American, or even of the Mexican, or of the Puerto Rican, etc., but to accurately describe in a con-

founding manner the characteristics and attributes of individuals living in the Culture of Poverty!" (p. 2) In other words, being Mexican or being Mexican American is not necessarily equivalent to being poor. Being poor is a sociological identity which has relevance but is not identical with the preservation of values historically derived from a rich set of experiences.

A further caution in dealing with cultural identity consists of identifying the differences between those individuals who were born in Mexico and then moved to the U.S., and those born in the U.S. of Mexican parents or ancestry. Dworkin (1971) conducted a survey among U.S.-born Mexican Americans and Mexican Americans born in Mexico. He asked these two groups to endorse traits generally associated with being Mexican American and he found that in order of decreasing amount of agreement, foreign-born Mexican Americans characterized themselves as: proud; religious; strong family ties; athletic; gregarious; friendly; happy; field workers; racially tolerant; short, fat and dark; practical; and well-adjusted. U.S.-born Mexican Americans agreed with the following items in decreasing order or importance: Emotional; unscientific; authoritarian; materialistic; old fashioned; poor and of a low social class; uneducated or poorly-educated; short, fat and dark; little care for education; mistrusted; proud; lazy; indifferent, and unambitious. From these two lists one derives the observation that the two groups hold different views of themselves and that place of birth is to be taken into consideration when studying the cultural identity of Mexican Americans. Also, it is to be observed that the self-view of those individuals born in Mexico is more positive than that of those individuals born in the U.S.. The explanation provided for this difference is that Mexican Americans born in the U.S. have high expectations provided by the society they use as a frame of reference. Mexican Americans born in Mexico may feel that they are quite well off compared to the humble background they come from.

The determinants of the unique cultural characteristics of the Mexican American have been conceptualized by Peñalosa (1970, p.5). He says that four major sets of influences have shaped a unique Mexican American culture: 1. The traditional Mexican culture; 2. The majority American culture; 3. A generally low social class influence; and 4. The minority status which Mexican Americans experience.

To some extent, given the above factors, it is easy to envision the emergence of a counterculture as a dominant form of response to oppressive forces in the life of the Mexican American. It is also likely, as in the case of the black American, that after the counterculture asserts itself a process of positive integration may begin to take place. Erickson (1966) asserts that "for a more inclusive identity is a development by which two groups who previously had come to depend on each other's negative identities (by living in a traditional situation of mutual enmity or in a symbiotic accommodation to one-sided exploitation) join their identities in such a way that new potentials are activated in both." (p. 166)

Communication as the main mechanism that holds society together is here expected to depend on the cultural identity of the members of the group (Mexican Americans in this case) which is striving for a positive integration without giving up its cultural identity. In confronting and joining the larger majority a certain type of cultural identity is expected to influence the communication style utilized for demanding social services and for job interviewing. Also, and not less important, the relationship between cultural identity and communication style should have implications for the establishment of meaningful human relationships with the larger majority of the American culture.

If in fact the cultural identity of particular individuals identified as Mexican Americans has an impact in the ways in which they communicate with

members of the majority culture, important recommendations may be derived from such a relationship, such as: 1. To enhance ethnic pride in those who lack it for better integration into the majority culture without assimilation; 2. If considering oneself Chicano and militant significantly affects the ways in which official institutions render services, Mexican Americans would be well advised to raise as a unique cultural group to strive for their rights; 3. If considering oneself an American of Mexican descent is related to adaptive communication styles, those traits peculiar to that variety of cultural identity could be isolated and made known for more successful communication and to promote options in cultural relations.

This type of research cannot be bias free. It is the contention of the authors of this paper that cultural identity and pride such as the identity presumably held by Chicanos is perhaps the most viable way of preserving cultural richness, distinctiveness and in the long run positive adaptation to the larger society.

We now turn to the consideration of Communication style. Communication style will be looked at taking into account related concepts such as competence, apprehension, and self-esteem.

STYLE

The subject of communicative "style" has been defined and approached from a number of perspectives. DeVito (1967, p. 249) defined style as, "the selection and arrangement of those linguistic features which are open to choice." Joos (1959) treated these variable linguistic features as "correlated to an equal or greater number of sociologically definable occasions." (p. 188). Style, then, would be the use of linguistic markers by a speaker to indicate or define the occasion for the listener. An important part of the idea of "occasion" is the social distance that is indicated between speaker and listener, this is

evident from Joos' delineation of five styles: intimate, casual, consultative, formal, and frozen.

Labov (1972) found that linguistic features used by speakers changed in a common direction as speech tasks were varied from the informal to formal along the dimension of attention paid to speech. As situations became less casual and styles became more "careful", the speech of informants tended to approach more closely the speech patterns of a prestige group: the upper middle class. Labov (1966) noted that the New York City lower middle class speaker tended even to "hypercorrect" his or her English at the formal end of the scale of attention paid to speech: to use "prestige" phonological and lexical features even in contexts in which these linguistic features were not actually used by the upper-middle-class reference group.

Norton (1978) went beyond the confines of verbal style in his definition of communicator style. He defined communicator style as, "the way one verbally and paraverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered, or understood." (p. 49)

Norton conceptualized the communicator style construct in terms of nine predictor constructs and one "dependent" variable. The nine predictors (ways of dealing with others in an interaction) were: dominant, dramatic, contentious, animated, impression-leaving, relaxed, attentive, open, and friendly. The dependent variable, communicator image, was roughly a self-impression of one's own communicative competence. Norton's Communicator Style Measure (CSM) operationalized these in terms of a set of self-report items measured on a Likert-type agree-disagree scale.

A number of studies have attempted to relate CSM variables to communicative competence and other related variables. Norton (1978) attempted to determine the "best predictors" of communicator image using smallest space analysis and

stepwise regression. In the smallest space solution, the subconstructs found to be closest to "communicator image" were: impression leaving, open, and dominant. Best predictors of positive communicator image suggested by stepwise regression were: dominant, impression-leaving, and open.

Brandt (1978) examined the relationship between the same set of predictor variables (with the exception of the variable "dramatic", which was replaced by a variable labelled "precise") and observers' judgments of subjects' social and task attractiveness and communicative effectiveness. A canonical correlation analysis indicated that the style variables impression-leaving, open, attentive, animated, relaxed, and to a lesser degree dominant and friendly, were all related to observers' perceptions of subjects' social and task attractiveness and communicative effectiveness. In addition, attentive, precise, and friendly were seen as predictors of task attractiveness.

Norton and Pettegrew (1977) looked at combinations of the communicator style variables dominant, open, and relaxed as related to interpersonal attractiveness. They found that individuals with a "dominant/open" style were seen by others as more attractive than individuals using "dominant/not-open", "not-dominant/relaxed", or "not-dominant/not-relaxed" styles.

Norton and Warnick (1976) examined the relationship between the CSM and several scales measuring the construct of "assertiveness". They found that the communicator style subconstructs as measured by the CSM: contentious, precise, impression-leaving, and dominant.

The choice of which of these various modes of style a given individual may employ is bound to be influenced by individual and cultural characteristics. The factors referred to by Peñalosa (1970) as determinants of the cultural characteristics of the Mexican American culture -- influence of the Mexican culture, influence of the (Anglo-) American culture, influence of low social

class, and minority status -- should have an effect on the communication styles and patterns adopted by Mexican Americans. In addition, the reference group(s) used by the individual, and his or her cultural identity in terms of identification with one or another culture (or degree of ambiguity of that identification) should have a profound effect on his/her communication. In general, then, it seems that the identification of an individual with a certain ethnic grouping may have a significant impact on the way he/she communicates with others. It is further felt that the way in which the individual's style is used and interpreted by others directly influences his/her success or effectiveness in communicative interactions. Therefore, we shall examine several concepts which have been found to be closely related to communication style and/or communicative effectiveness.

COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION

Communication apprehension is one factor that may be expected to exert an influence on the communication of Mexican-Americans with Anglo-Americans. McCrosky, Daly, Richmond, and Falcione (1977) comment that:

> ...for some, communication experiences have been unrewarding, indeed punishing, and as a consequence these individuals avoid situations where communication might be required. (p. 270)

For many Mexican Americans, communication experiences involving Anglo Americans have been unrewarding or punishing. Low social class, minority status, and special problems relating to bilingualism are relevant to this.

Bossard (1945) presented the hypothesis of "linguistic identification with status," contending that

> a second language and its vestiges are bound up with the status of the particular minority group which speaks that language. (p. 709)

Bossard conducted case studies of bilinguals to assess the impact of growing up in a home in which one language is spoken, but into a society in which another

language is dominant. He noted a number of problems which occurred, especially in cases in which the first language of the individual was negatively regarded by the dominant cultural group and in which the individual desired to assimilate into the society of the dominant culture. Damage to a child's self-concept caused by hostility toward his/her language and culture by peers, school difficulties arising both from negative attitudes toward his/her language and culture, and communication problems caused by language and cultural differences were long-lasting in the cases studied. Thus, some degree of communication apprehension may result from such communication difficulties with the larger Anglo culture.

Bossard identified a number of protective devices which these bilinguals developed. These included a restrained manner of speaking, inconspicuous behavior, and the use of meticulous English.

Bossard's hypothesis of linguistic identification with status was supported by Barker (1947) in the latter's study of Tucson, Arizona Mexican-American community. Barker noted that inferior social status was associated with speaking English with a "Mexican accent". Higher-class Mexican-American families were observed to speak English with their children, and expressing fear that an "accent" would endanger the children's future chances in the job market.

Lambert (1967) cites a number of studies which indicate that language and dialect are used to make judgements about the competence and personality characteristics of others, with speakers of languages or dialects of non-dominant groups receiving attributions of less desirable traits than speakers of prestige languages and dialects. Thus, the Mexican-American may receive more negative attributions (and responses) for no reason other than the accent with which he/she speaks English.

Anxiety may also arise from actual communication difficulties caused by

appropriation of English and Spanish to different domains of language behavior. Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens (1964) point out that the bilingual typically is not a "complete" bilingual in the sense of being fully competent in the use of both languages for dealing with all subjects and situations. There is usually an appropriation of one language to one set of subjects or domains and the other language to another set of subjects or domains, with some overlap. This tends to limit the bilingual's competence in the monolingual's language, most often with regard to more informal styles or registers. The problem of a lack of informal linguistic categories common to Mexican-Americans and Anglo-Americans (Barker, 1947, p. 200) may be expected to increase as the degree of segregation of the two groups increases and informal contact between Anglos and Mexican-Americans decreases.

Put another way, bilinguals among other bilinguals tend to switch languages to signify a change in the domain of discourse, the relationship, or the degree of formality; cases in which the monolingual will use a change in style or register rather than language. This practice has been noted by several researchers (Barker, 1947, Fishman, 1971 a, 1971 b; Gumperz, 1967).

This difference in the usage of language may lead to negative social consequences for the Mexican-American bilingual in his/her attempts to communicate socially with Anglos, leading to apprehension concerning such communication.

While inherent stylistic differences due to language orientations and cultural norms may result in a high level of communication apprehension, such apprehension may have subsequent effects upon an individual's communication style.

Ellis (1978) examined traits predicting the use of "one-up" or "one-down" relational control styles in interpersonal communication. In the one-up condition, the individual is asserting control over the definition of the

relationship, whereas in the one-down condition, she/he is accepting the other's definition of the relationship, and takes a submissive relational role.

Ellis found that persons who consistently used "one-up" styles tended to be intolerant of ambiguity and desired to structure their social environments. One characteristic of those using this control style was a high degree of concern over how they were perceived by others.

The individual who meets the description of the user of a one-up control style should exhibit a communication style that is dominant, animated, and relaxed.

It was found by Ellis that individuals who consistently used "one-down" (or submissive) control styles were apprehensive about communication while still desiring social relationships:

> He needs to associate with others but fears the process of communication. When a member of this group does interact with others he is quite willing to accept the submissive role in a relationship. In short, the best predictor of this control style is communication apprehension. (p. 189)

The individual who meets this description should exhibit a communication style that is attentive and precise, but not dominant, contentious, relaxed, or animated. Such a style could be labelled "accomodating."

These conclusions are consistent with findings of Norton and Warnick (1976) that low anxiety measures correlated highly with speaking dominance, frequency, and intensity.

In addition to its effects on communicator style, communication apprehension leads to greater avoidance of communication overall (McCrosky et. al., 1977). The Mexican-American who is apprehensive about communicating with Anglos should tend to avoid situations in which he/she may have to do so. Burgoon (1976) found a significant negative relationship between the approach/avoidance factor of the Unwillingness to Communicate scale (which measures a dimension involving communication apprehension) and amount of participation of subjects

in a group decision-making task, information-seeking, and information-giving. This study also indicated that the amount of reward that is perceived to arise from communication is not as important as influence on the individual's participation as is communication apprehension.

SELF-ESTEEM

Much of the discussion on communication apprehension also relates to the self-esteem of the Mexican American individual. There is a close relationship between the two constructs. McCrosky, et. al. (1977) found that self-esteem and oral communication apprehension were inversely related. Similarly, Burgoon (1976) linked low self-esteem with unwillingness to Communicate. It should be kept in mind, however, that an individual may have generally high self-esteem, but still experience anxiety about communicating in certain situations or contexts.

The effects of the social and cultural status of the Mexican American in the United States on self-esteem have been seen as basically negative. Macias (1974) accuses schools of practicing insensitivity and discrimination against the language and culture of Mexican American children, and contends that schools thus have, "had a definite effect in helping to destroy their self-concept." (p. 61)

Peñalosa (1975) contends that the self-concept of the Mexican American child may even be lowered in schools enlightened enough (or forced) to provide bilingual instruction, if that instruction does not take into account the dialect of Spanish that is actually spoken in his/her community.

Certainly the influence of culturally-biased intelligence testing on Mexican American children in the schools must have its effect on the young people upon which it is administrated (Vasquez, 1973; Mercer, 1977; Olmedo, 1977).

Acosta (1977), referring to the influence of discrimination and poverty

on the psychological well-being of Mexican-Americans, concluded that, "these oppressive conditions should certainly make Mexican-Americans particularly vulnerable to serious psychological distress and lowered levels of self-esteem." (p. 216)

Lambert (1967) gives us some indication of the extent to which the negative attributes assigned to a non-dominant cultural group are internalized by members of that group. In his studies of the attributions given by subjects to speakers of English and French in Quebec, he found that not only did English speaking subjects rate a French speaker more negatively than an English speaker, but that native French speakers also rated a French speaker more negatively. This leads us to believe that an individual's self-esteem, as well as the status attributed to that individual by others, may in part be a function of the language habits of those involved.

COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

Another way in which the study of communication style has both social and individual importance is in its relationship to the communicative competence of the individual. Bochner and Kelly define competence as, "a person's ability to interact effectively with other people." (p. 288). They regard "effectiveness" not only in terms of the ability of the individual to accomplish his or her goals, but also in terms of the ability to work with others and to adapt to changes in the situation or environment.

Wiemann (1977) stresses the importance of "everyday conversation" in forming and maintaining the social identity of participants. Wiemann sees the primary function of conversation as, "the establishment and maintenance of self and social identities of the participants." (p. 196) This leads to an emphasis on the long-term effects of ones communicative behavior on relationships with others. Competence, then, is defined in terms of more than

one's ability to get what one desires or to define the relationship on one's own terms; rather, it involves the development of a relationship satisfying to both parties. Thus:

> Communicative competence can be defined as the ability of an interactant to choose among available communicative behaviors in order that he may successfully accomplish his own interpersonal goals during an encounter while maintaining the face and line of his fellow interactants within the constraints of the situation. (Wiemann, 1977, p. 198)

The component of competence which involves the long-term effects of one's behavior on others is often conceptualized and measured in terms of one's social desirability or attractiveness. For example, Brandt (1978) used observer judgements of subjects' social and task attractiveness, as well as judgments of the effectiveness of subjects' communication, as indicators of social competence.

The issue of competence is doubly important for the American of Mexican descent. First, communication style, as well as linguistic and cultural characteristics, will have some influence on the individual's ability to interact effectively with Anglo Americans. As alluded to earlier, the different self-identities held by Americans of Mexican descent correspond to different styles of interaction. Implications of these differences will be explicated in further sections.

Secondly, the degree to which the individual's style results in competent communication may be used as a partial indication of his/her social desirability or attractiveness. For the American of Mexican origin, this desirability or attractiveness may be seen as a function, at least partly, of his/her cultural identity and its corresponding communication styles.

Hypotheses

At the outset of this paper, a number of factors relating to the cultural

identity of Mexican-Americans were discussed. The cultural identity of Mexican Americans should affect their communication styles and practices through effects on such variables as communication apprehension, self-esteem, perceived reward from communication, stress, and goals of interaction.

Throughout the rest of this paper we will refer to cultural identity in terms of discrete categories for the sake of clarity; however, it must be kept in mind that cultural identity is best regarded as a continuum. We will use the term "American of Mexican Ancestry" to describe individuals who would first identify themselves as plainly Americans. "Mexican American" will be used to describe those individuals who are conscious of the duality of their existance and who live in conflict; whose identification is both with Mexican and American cultures. The term "Chicano" will be used to describe the individual who sees himself as part of a unique cultural entity separate from either Mexican or American culture. The term "Mexican" will be used to describe the cultural identity of one whose primary referent in day to day life is Mexican culture; one who sees him/her-self primarily as Mexican rather than Mexican American, Chicano, or American of Mexican Ancestry.

MEXICAN-AMERICAN

We will first deal with the communication style that would be expected to arise from consciousness of duality: of being both Mexican and American (Peñalosa, 1970).

This remains a rather broad category. Individuals who identify themselves as both Mexican and American may range from those who see personal assimilation into Anglo-American society and culture as both desirable and possible, to those who see themselves more in terms of Mexican heritage, but who accept to some degree Anglo-American cultural values and perspectives.

Mexican Americans near the "American" end of this "dual" identity would

seem to correspond best to the bilinguals studied by Bossard (1945): those who desire acceptance into the broader American society, and who develop such "protective devices" as a restrained manner of speaking, inconspicuous behavior, and the use of meticulous English. These protective devices would seem to correspond in CSM measures to "not-dramatic" and "not-animated." The individual using these devices should, using Labov's (1972) contextual style dimension, be very high in attention paid to speech. That is, they should be very aware of their grammar and articulation, seeking to accomodate these to the relevant English norms.

The Mexican American who perceive most rewards as coming from association with the Anglo-American culture, yet who is apprehensive concerning communication with Anglo-Americans should evidence a one-down relational control style as described by Ellis (1978). The primary goals in interaction tend to be acceptance and affiliation. Most of the Mexican Americans who combine these qualities may be expected to be found among those who are dual-cultural. The communication behaviors that may be expected to go along with this relational control style were discussed previously: generally a style which is attentive, precise, non-dominant, non-contentious, not relaxed, and not animated.

One thing that we might expect is for the Mexican American who is in conflict about his/her cultural identity to experience more anxiety and stress. This is supported by some of the research into the effects of acculturation on Mexican Americans. Senour (1977) comments that:

> The effect of acculturation on Chicanos is not fully understood. Some data suggest that individuals who either retain their cultural values or wholly ascribe to the value system of the majority culture manifest less psychopathology than those in the midst of acculturation. (p. 333)

This contention is also consistent with the theoretical treatment of the effects of social mobility proposed by Blau (1956). Blau proposed two processes

that he labelled the "acculturation pattern" and the "social insecurity pattern". Blau contended that mobile persons would not be well integrated into either social class, and would tend to have vlaues that were in between those characteristic of each class. He also pointed out that a person poorly integrated into either group would have less day to day social support, resulting in greater insecurity and anxiety. A parallel process may be hypothesized for those who are neither fully integrated into the traditional Mexican culture, or into Anglo-American culture, and who do hot have an orientation toward an alternative "Chicano" culture.

In a synthesis of research findings on three language variables, Bradac, Bowers, and Courtright (1979) make the generalization that cognitive stress is inversely related to language intensity. Individuals with a "dual" (and therefore somewhat stressful) cultural identity should then tend toward use of less-intense language.

Finally, it should be pointed out that if the individual uses Anglo Americans as a reference group, he/she should be more highly susceptible to lowered self-esteem due to rejection, ridicule, or internalization of cultural stereotypes concerning Mexicans or Mexican Americans.

From this discussion, the following set of hypotheses about the communication style and practices of the individual who sees him/herself as both Mexican and American can be derived:

H1: The individual who identifies him/her self as both a Mexican and an American will find communication with Anglo Americans rewarding, but will also experience apprehension about communicating with them.

H2: The individual who identifies him/herself as both a Mexican and an American will tend to use an "accomodating" communication style in communication with Anglo Americans. This style involves the following values: not-dominant, not-contentious, not-relaxed, not-animated,

not-dramatic, attentive, precise.

From the above two hypotheses, we derive:

H3: The individual who perceives communication with Anglo Americans as rewarding, but who experiences a high degree of communication apprehension will tend to use and "accomodating" style in such communication.

H4: The individual who identifies with both Mexican and Anglo American cultures will tend toward a high degree of conscious awareness of his/her grammar and pronunciation of English when communicating with Anglo Americans.

"CHICANO"

Individuals who see themselves as having a unique Chicano cultural identity may be expected to use communication styles in communication with Anglo Americans which are different from the styles employed by individuals whose cultural identity is better described as "Mexican-American".

The individual who perceives him/herself as a Chicano(a) would be more liable to see relevant rewards as originating in the Mexican-American community rather than through social contact with Anglo Americans or acceptance by them. Anglo Americans would not be used as a reference group and a Chicano would tend to be unconcerned about being accepted socially by them. There should be somewhat less anxiety about communicating with Anglo Americans due to this factor.

Since the individual who identifies with Chicano culture does not desire to assimilate into the Anglo-American culture, and should be less apprehensive than the "Mexican American" about communicating with representatives of that culture, there should be no reason for he/she to employ the "protective devices" mentioned by Bossard. Therefore, we may expect the person with this cultural identity to be more animated, and dramatic in his/her style of communicating.

Although the person who identifies with a Chicano cultural identity will be less concerned with being accepted by Anglo-Americans, he/she should be more concerned than the "Mexican American" with how he/she is perceived by those with whom he/she comes in contact. He/she will tend to show pride in his/her unique culture and to be sensitive to attempts of others to degrade it. Ellis (1978) found that concern with how others perceive one was a major factor in predicting use of a one-up relational control style.

This will lead to assertive communication. The individual with this cultural identity will tend to take charge of interactions and will be relatively quick to stand up for his/her rights. There is no reason to believe that he/she will show special attentiveness or interest in communicating with Anglo Americans. Since the individual who identifies with Chicano culture should not have a great deal of concern about being accepted by Anglo-Americans, he/she should show no tendency toward ingratiating behaviors.

The self-esteem of the individual who identifies with Chicano culture should be higher than the self-esteem of the person who identifies simultaneously with Mexican and American cultures. The person who identifies him/herself as Chicano should be less likely to accept negative judgments and stereotypes prevalent in Anglo-American culture and media. Levels of stress should also be less, due to not living in conflict of identities and allegiences. These factors should help reduce apprehension about communicating with Anglos and should contribute to an assertive style.

This discussion leads to the following hypotheses:

H5: The individual who identifies with a unique "Chicano" culture will tend to use an assertive style of communication with Anglo Americans. This style will involve the following CSM values: dominant, contentious, impression-leaving, dramatic, animated, not-attentive.

H6: The individual who identifies with a unique "Chicano" culture will perceive communication with Anglo Americans as less rewarding than will the individual whose cultural identification is "Mexican American."

H7: The individual who identifies with a unique "Chicano" culture will have less apprehension about communicating with Anglo Americans than will the individual whose cultural identification is "Mexican American."

"MEXICAN"

The individual whose cultural identity is "Mexican" should perceive communication with Anglos as not socially rewarding. The person whose conscious identification is with Mexican culture should thus find acculturation into the American society as undesirable, and perhaps irrelevant to their cultural goals. They reflect, rather, the richness and diversity of the Mexican culture.

Significantly, it is felt that individuals who self-identify with this grouping will not suffer from generalized stress caused by ambivalence concerning his/her cultural identity as is hypothesized for the "Mexican-American". This should lead to use of higher-intensity language and a more animated communication style than that characteristic of individuals with a dual "Mexican-American" cultural identity.

Although factors such as language differences and non-receptive Anglo attitudes should serve to produce a noticable amount of apprehension concerning communication with Anglo Americans, apprehension should be lower than for the individual with "Mexican American" cultural identity. If rewards are small from social interaction with Anglo Americans, then the cost of rejection by them is also small. Whether he/she is accepted by Anglo Americans is of little consequence if the individual does not desire affiliation or use Anglo Americans as a reference group.

Neither an "accommodating" nor an "assertive" communication style should be predicted for the individual who identifies primarily with "Mexican" culture. Such an individual should be less concerned with being accepted by Anglo-Americans than the "Mexican American" and less concerned with being respected by them than the "Chicano".

Empirical evidence is lacking concerning communication styles characteristic of the Mexican culture. However, the considerations upon which predictions about the communication styles of "Mexican Americans" and "Chicanos" have previously been made suggest that:

H_8: The individual who identifies him/herself primarily with Mexican culture should show a communication style in communicating with Anglo Americans that has the following characteristics: animated, not-contentious, not-careful.

H_9: The communication style of the individual who identifies primarily with Mexican culture will be more dominant than the communication style of the individual who identifies with both Mexican and American cultures, in communication with Anglo Americans.

H_{10}: The communication style of the individual who identifies primarily with Mexican culture will be less dominant than the individual whose cultural identification is with a unique "Chicano" culture.

"AMERICANS OF MEXICAN ANCESTRY"

In the case of the individual whose cultural identity is "American of Mexican Ancestry", we must deal with this factor: the degree to which the individual is actually assimilated into (Anglo-) American culture. It seems most likely that the individuals who identify themselves as Americans of Mexican Ancestry will tend to be those who have actually been more or less assimilated into the broader culture. These individuals should have higher

than average socio-economic status, which implies no power difference involved in most of their communication with representatives of Anglo-American culture.

Members of this group should show little if any special anxiety about communicating with Anglo Americans. The self-esteem of members of this group should also be high.

Although rewards should be perceived as originating primarily from within Anglo-American culture, the degree of integration of the "American of Mexican Ancestry" into that culture should make his/her acceptance by any particular member of that cultural group a matter of minimal importance. Thus, the individual with this cultural identity is not expected to exhibit an accomodating communication style.

The hypotheses which have been developed from this perspective are:

H_{11}: The individual whose cultural identity is "American of Mexican Ancestry" will tend to show a communication style similar to that shown by Anglo Americans of similar socio-economic status.

H_{12}: The communication style used by the "American of Mexican Ancestry" will tend to be relaxed, dominant, not-contentious.

H_{13}: The more American the individual feels, the more positive his/her attitude will be toward social contacts and communication with Anglo Americans.

The perceived rewards from social contact should be high among "Americans of Mexican Ancestry" and "Mexican Americans", and these groups should have a positive attitude toward communication with Anglo Americans in social settings. "Chicanos" and "Mexicans" should see few rewards as deriving from social contact with Anglo-Americans. The first choice of each of the latter two groups for social contacts should not be Anglo Americans.

In terms of actual amount of communication with Anglo Americans, the order may not be the same. The degree to which communication is perceived

as rewarding has not been shown to be as strong a predictor of amount of communication as is communication apprehension. Thus we would predict the following:

H_{14}: In terms of actual amount of communication with Anglo Americans, the following ordering (from greatest amount to least) will be observed: Americans of Mexican Ancestry, Chicano, Mexican-American, Mexican.

Instrumentation

In order to test the aforestated hypotheses a self-report questionnaire will be administered to a sample of Mexican Americans in two different geographical areas of the United States: the Southwest and the industrial Midwest.

Consistent with the previous discussion of cultural identity, this construct will be measured not only in terms of the individual's conscious identification with a particular label, but also in terms of preferred food, music, art, and language, as well as opinions on matters relating to cultural identity. Informants will be asked to describe themselves using Farris and Brymer's (1970) Twenty Statements Test. Proposed measures are shown in Appendix A.

Discussion has indicated that place of birth, socio-economic status, and demographic variables should affect the responses of informants. Measures of these variables will be taken.

Communication variables examined will include amount of communication (total, formal, and informal) with Anglo-Americans, as well as measures of communication style. Respondents will be asked to report the number of times per day they normally engage in communication with Anglo-Americans, and the amount of times they conversed with Anglo-Americans the previous day.

Respondents will be asked to report how often they talk with Anglo-Americans on three sets of topics ranging from impersonal to personal: work or business, social matters, and personal affairs or problems. These will be reported on a Likert-type scale with response categories ranging from "never" to "every day".

Communication style will be measured using a modification of Norton's (1978) Communicator Style Measure. This takes the form of a number of statements about the respondents communication style to which he/she is asked to respond on a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". The CSM measures will be modified to apply specifically to communication with Anglo-Americans. The CSM will also be modified to include items corresponding to the style variable "precise" used in Brandt's (1978) study of communicator style and social competence. Finally, items will be added to measure the amount of attention paid to speech, consistent with Labov's (1972) discussion of contextual styles. These will also be cast as responses to statements about one's communication on a Likert-type agree-disagree scale, in order to be consistent with other style measures. Thus, the dimension of attention paid to speech may be treated as another CSM-type variable which we may call "careful". This variable is defined along with other style variables in Appendix B. Examples of communication style measures are provided in appendix C.

Our hypotheses require measurements also of the apprehension of respondents in communicating with Anglo Americans, and the degree to which such communication is perceived as rewarding. These measures were obtained by rewording items from McCrosky's (1970) PRCA and Burgoon's (1976) UWC scales to apply to communication with Anglo Americans.

The instrument will be extensively pretested to avoid the use of language that may be considered to be inappropriate by the respondents and to assess the variability of each of the items.

Discussion

A number of issues relevant to cultural identity and communication styles of Mexican Americans have been raised, and predictions have been made about how cultural identity will affect communication style. Comments on the utility or communication effectiveness of the various styles hypothesized remain to be made.

The communication style that we hypothesize for an individual identifying with both Mexican and American culture ("Mexican American") is seen to lack most of the attributes associated with competence, attractiveness, and good communicator image in the studies cited earlier (Norton, 1978; Brandt, 1978; Norton and Pettegrew, 1977; Norton and Warnick, 1976). The only variable on which the "Mexican American" is predicted to score highly on, and which in turn seems to be associated with competence, is "attentiveness".

It was also predicted, however, that the person with a "Mexican American" cultural identity would tend to pay more attention to speech in communication with Anglo Americans than would other individuals. In particular, he/she should be consciously aware of his/her English pronunciation and grammar when communicating with Anglo Americans. The extent to which this actually leads to speech closer to the middle-class Anglo-American standard should be indicative of how attractive a communication partner the individual should be regarded by Anglo Americans. However, this could be reversed if enough anxiety or stress is generated to result in nonfluencies or other obvious indications of stress.

On such variables associated with effectiveness and attractiveness as "dominant", "relaxed", "impression-leaving", "animated", and "dramatic", the individual who identifies with a unique 'Chicano" culture is hypothesized to score higher than the person whose cultural identity is "Mexican American"

or "Mexican", as we have defined them. However, the communication style hypothesized for the "Chicano" is also described by high "contentiousness". This is probably a negative attribute in terms of long-term social and cooperative relationships with Anglo-Americans, although it may contribute to effectiveness in obtaining immediate behavioral compliance with short-term goals. Interesting in this regard is the fact that the communication style predicted for the individual identifying with "Chicano" culture does not include any of Brandt's (1978) predictors of "task attractiveness".

It should be noted that the above discussion is conducted within a perspective with a decidedly U.S.-cultural bias. That is, the research which led to these conclusions was based on a mode of operation in which the English language as spoken by the majority U.S. culture was the norm. Therefore, what one considers "effective", "competent", or even "negative" may vary substantially when examining minority identities and communication behaviors in other nations or cultures. In particular, research relating communicator style with communicative competence has been conducted in single-culture (usually Anglo-American) situations rather than cross-cultural settings.

In proceeding with the theoretical perspective and research proposed herein, several cautions should be mentioned. First, as implied earlier, special care should be taken to utilize appropriate ethnic labels when referring to Mexican Americans (henceforth referring to all as Americans of Mexican descent, regardless of self-cultural identification), both during the conducting of the research and when presenting recommendations based on research findings. While any recommendation is by nature somewhat normative, we should make it clear that any recommendation made on the basis of the research proposed herein would be for informative and descriptive purposes rather than to indicate what is "correct". Such a recommendation should be

geared toward usage by Americans of Anglo and Mexican heritage in effectively communicating and dealing with others.

A second caution involves the terminology used here may differ substantially from that used by others. For example, some authors refer to all Americans of Mexican heritage (or Latin heritage in general) as "Chicano". Such differences in terminology and definition should be kept in mind when making comparisons of our work with other research and normative pieces.

There is a need for cross-cultural research that will provide evidence on the impact of cultural identity on communication between cultural groups in the United States, such as the research outlined herein. An important set of questions to address is, "Why should one study Mexican Americans in particular? Could one not study any given cultural or racial minority in the U.S. and generalize the results?" The answer to the latter question is, of course no. Ethnic and racial groups all have characteristics specific unto themselves, and Mexican Americans have a number of defining characteristics and situational conditions which make their case special.

Mexican Americans are, generally, quite a visible group. They and Black Americans are possibly the most easily identifiable, most cohesive minority groups in the U.S. They are also the largest. Additionally, the proximity of the Mexican Americans' homeland has resulted in special migratory and cultural patterns and problems. And, as indicated throughout, it is felt that Mexican Americans employ their own unique communicative styles based in part on their self-identification with the Mexican and/or the American cultures.

Further implications are, of course, important. What, for example, are the effects on persuasion, respect, attraction, and learning of violations of expectations when these involve cultural stereotypes? The present study restricts itself to the relationship between cultural identity and cross-

cultural communication style. Should results confirm the predictions made about this relationship, empirical research on the effects of these styles on judgments and behaviors of Anglo-Americans and Mexican-Americans would assume greater importance.

It should be noted that the research herein proposed is speculative in nature, but that there is no other way to build a body of theory and research. Once the hypotheses here proposed are confirmed or rejected, further refinements will be made possible in the theoretical perspective outlined. All this is, hopefully, for the benefit of the field and that of the growing minority of Mexican-Americans in their struggle for a positive adaptation to the larger society in which they live.

APPENDIX A.

EXAMPLES OF
CULTURAL IDENTITY MEASURES

Now we would like you to answer the following questions. Choose one answer for each question.

--In case of a disagreement between the U.S. and Mexico which side would you take? The U.S._____ Mexico_____ Neither_____

—What language do you think should be used in the schools to teach your children or the children of people like you?

English only_____ English and Spanish_____Spanish only_____

Other (Please specify)_____

--What language do you speak at home most of the time?

English_____ Spanish_____ Both about equally_____

Other (Please specify)_____

—What is most important for you about other people?

That they are good people_____ That they are good workers_____Both_____

—How much do you like American food?

Very much_____ Pretty much_____ A little_____ Not at all_____

--How much do you like Mexican food?

Very much_____ Pretty much_____ A little_____ Not at all_____

--"I have a unique culture."

strongly agree_____ agree_____ disagree_____ strongly disagree_____

--"All Americans should be alike."

strongly agree_____ agree_____ disagree_____ strongly disagree_____

--"I am proud of who I am."

strongly agree_____ agree_____ disagree_____ strongly disagree_____

APPENDIX B.

Communicator Style Construct

ATTENTIVE

-a tendency to listen, to show interest in what the other is saying, and to deliberately react in such a way that the other know's she/he is being listened to.

DOMINANT

-a tendency to "take charge" of the interaction and/or to attempt to lead or control the behaviors of others in it.

DRAMATIC *

-involving the manipulation of exagerations, fantasies, stories, metaphors, rhythm, voice, and other stylistic devices to highlight or understate content.

OPEN

-a tendency to reveal personal things about the self, to easily express feelings and emotions, and to be frank and sincere.

ANIMATED

-a tendency to provide frequent eye contact, to use facial expressions, and to gesture often.

RELAXED

-a tendency to be calm and collected, not nervous under pressure, and to not show nervous mannerisms.

FRIENDLY

-a tendency to be encouraging to others, to acknowledge others' contributions to the interaction, and to openly express admiration.

IMPRESSION-LEAVING

-manifesting a visible or memorable style of communicating.*

a tendency to be remembered because of what one says and/or the way one says it.

CONTENTIOUS

-a tendency to be argumentative or overtly hostile toward others

PRECISE

-a tendency to use very specific language and to try to be very accurate and specific about what one means by what one says.

CAREFUL**

-a tendency to pay conscious attention to speech and language, in particular to concern oneself with using proper grammar and pronunciation.

* From Norton (1978). Unstarred items from Brandt (1978).
** Adapted from Labov (1972).

APPENDIX C.

Examples of Communication Style Measures

DOMINANT

--"I try to take charge of the conversation when I am with Anglos."

strongly agree_____ agree_____ disagree_____ strongly disagree_____

--"I tend to dominate informal conversations with Anglos."

strongly agree_____ agree_____ disagree_____ strongly disagree_____

ANIMATED

--"I am very expressive in the way I communicate with Anglos."

strongly agree_____ agree_____ disagree_____ strongly disagree_____

--"I like to use colorful language when I talk to Anglos."

strongly agree_____ agree_____ disagree_____ strongly disagree_____

CONTENTIOUS

--"When I disagree with Anglos, I am very quick to challenge them."

strongly agree_____ agree_____ disagree_____ strongly disagree_____

ATTENTIVE

--"I deliberately act in such way with Anglos that they know I am listening to them.

agree strongly_____ agree_____ disagree_____ disagree strongly_____

--"In communicating with Anglos, I really like to listen very carefully.

agree strongly_____ agree_____ disagree_____ disagree strongly_____

REFERENCES

Acosta, F. S. Ethnic variables in psychotherapy: the Mexican American. In J. Martinez (Ed.), Chicano Psychology. New York, New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Barker, G. C. Social functions of language in the Mexican-American community. Acta Americana, 1947, 5, 185-202.

Blau, P. M. Social Mobility and interpersonal relations. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 290-295.

Bochner, A. & Kelly, C. Interpersonal competence: Rationale, philosophy, and implementation of a conceptual framework. Speech Teacher, 1974, 23, 279-301.

Bossard, J. H. S. The bilingual as a person -- linguistic identification with status. American Sociological Review, 1945, 23, 699-709.

Brandac, J. J., Bowers, J. W. & Courtright, J. A. Three language variables in communication research: Intensity, immediacy, and diversity. Human Communication Research, 1979, 5, 257-269.

Brandt, D. R. On Linking Social Performance with Social Competence: Some Relations Between Communicative Style and Attributions of Interpersonal Attractiveness and Effectiveness. Paper presented to the Interpersonal and Small Group Interaction Division, Speech Communication Association, November, 1978, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Burgoon, J. K. The unwillingness-to-communicate scale: Development and validation. Communication Monographs, 1976, 13, 60-69.

Casavantes, E. J. A New Look at the Attributes of the Mexican American. Alburquerque, New Mexico: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1971.

De Vito, J. A. Style and stylistics: an attempt at definition. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1967, 53, 248-255.

Dworkin, A. G. Stereotypes and Self-Images Held by Native-Born and Foreign-Born Mexican Americans. In J. H. Burma (Ed.), Mexican-Americans in the United States: A Reader. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, 1970.

Ellis, D. G. Trait predictors of relational control. In B. D. Rubin (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 2. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1978.

Erikson, E. H. The Concept of Identity in Race Relations: Notes and Queries. Daedalus, 1966, 95, 145-171.

Farris, B. and Brymer, R. A. Differential Socialization of Latin and Anglo-American Youth: An exploratory Study of the Self Concept. In J. H. Burma (Ed.), Mexican Americans in the United States: A Reader. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, 1970.

Fishman, J. A. The relationship between micro- and macro- sociolinguistics in the study of who speaks what language to whom and when. In J. Fishman, (Ed.), Bilingualism in the Barrio. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1971.

Fishman, J. A. How I talk to my parents. In J. Fishman (Eds), Bilingualism in the Barrio. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1971.

Gumperz, J. On the linguistic markers of bilingual communication. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 48-57.

Halliday, M. A. K., McIntosh, A. & Strevens, P. The users and uses of language. (reprinted) In J. Fishman (Ed.), Readings in the Sociology of Language. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton, 1968.

Hernandez, D. La Raza Satellite System. Aztlan, 1970, 1, 1, 13-36.

Joos, M. The isolation of styles. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics (Georgetown University), 1959, 12, 107-113.

Labov, W. Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Lambert, W. E. A Social Psychology of Bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 2, 91-109.

Macias, R. F. Developing a bilingual culturally-relevant educational program for Chicanos. Aztlan, 1974, 4, 61-77.

McCroskey, J. C. Measures of communication bound anxiety. Speech Monographs, 1970, 37, 269-277.

McCroskey, J. C., Daly, J. A., Richmond, V. P. & Falcione, R. L. Studies of the relationship between communication apprehension and self-esteem. Human Communication Research, 1977, 3, 269-277.

Mercer, J. R. Identifying the gifted Chicano child. In J. Martinez, (Ed.) Chicano Psychology. New York, New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Norton, R. W. Foundation of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4, 99-112.

Norton, R. W. & Pettegrew, L. S. Communicator style as an effect determinant of attraction. Communication Research, 1977, 4, 257-282.

Norton, R., Salyer, R., Baker, N., Bedner, D. & McGough, T. Impressions of interpersonal dramatic style. Paper submitted to the interpersonal Division for the Speech Communication Association, 1978, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Norton, R. & Warnick, B. Assertiveness as a communication construct. Human Communication Research, 1976, 3, 62-66.

Olmedo, E. L. Psychological testing and the Chicano: a reassessment. In J. Martinez (Ed.), Chicano Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Peñalosa, F. Sociolinguistic theory and the Chicano community. Aztlan, 1975, 6, 1-11.

Peñalosa, F. Toward an Operational Definition of the Mexican American. Aztlan, 1970, 1, 1, 1-12.

Sarbaugh, L. E. Intercultural Communication. Rochelle Park, New Jersey: Hayden, 1979.

Senour, M. N. Psychology of the Chicana. In J. Martinez (Ed.), Chicano Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Vasquez, J. Measurement of Intelligence and language differences. Aztlan, 1973, 3, 155-163.

Wiemann, J. M. Explication and test of a model of communicative competence. Human Communication Research, 3, 195-213.